



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,676	01/29/2004	Gerhard Benning	2001P15983WOUS	5989

7590 08/06/2008
SIEMENS CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT.
170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

BRANDT, CHRISTOPHER M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/06/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/767,676	Applicant(s) BENNING ET AL.	
	Examiner CHRISTOPHER M. BRANDT	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 18-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 18-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 15, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

This Action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on May 15, 2008. **Claims 1-13, and 18-24** are now pending in the present application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13, and 18-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point

out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-8, 12, 13, and 18-24 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lindgren et al. (US Patent 6,411,632 B2, hereinafter Lindgren)** in view of **Singhal et al. (US PGPUB 2003/0041175 A2, hereinafter Singhal)** and further in view of **McKeeth (US Patent 7,188,175 B1)**.

Consider **claim 1 (and similarly applied to claim 19)**. Lindgren discloses an arrangement for a wireless connection of terminal devices to a communication system (abstract), comprising:

a data packet network for the transmission of data packets using network addresses valid within the network (column 4 lines 10-25, 38-41, read as TCP/IP network with the network hub, which includes an IP address for communications using the TCP/IP protocol);

a transition device coupled to the data packet network, the transition device comprises a mobile device that is serviced by the transition device and a coupling table, the mobile device locates a terminal device within range of the mobile device, the coupling table includes an

address of the located terminal device (column 4 lines 42-45, read as the network hub further includes a translation table for storing the mobile identification numbers (MIN) of mobile stations being serviced by a wireless office interconnected with the network hub);

a server coupled to the data packet network for controls connections to the terminal device and controls roaming for the terminal device, the server includes an allocation table (column 4 lines 38-41, 47-52, read as the network, hub includes an IP address for communications using the TCP/IP protocol and a signal point code (address) for communications with respect to the SS7 protocol. There is also a translation table that enables the location of mobile stations according to the IP address of its serving wireless office and a network table addressing table, includes a listing of all nodes and signaling point codes (addresses) within the public access network); and

a packet-based alignment protocol for the dynamic alignment of the allocation table with the coupling table (column 4 lines 34-38, 45-47, read as the conversion between transportation of the IS-41 messages by the SS7 protocol or the TCP/IP protocol is performed by processing means within the network hub and enables interconnection of the public network to the wireless offices. It is also discloses that associated with the stored MIN are the IP address of the wireless office in which a mobile station is registered).

Singhal substantially discloses the claimed invention but fails to teach that the transition device comprises a short-range radio module and a coupling table (Lindgren discloses a mobile station that is coupled to a wireless office, which in turn is coupled to network hub).

However, Singhal teaches that the transition device comprises a short-range radio module and a coupling table (paragraph 28, read as short range access points that use a routing

coordinator that maintains a plurality of connection table records and wherein a plurality of Home Agent Masqueraders (HAMs) and Foreign Agent Masqueraders (FAMs) communicate with the routing coordinator).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of Singhal into the invention of Lindgren in order to ensure that client data connections are preserved as the client travels throughout the short-range wireless network environment (paragraph 28).

In addition, Lindgren and Singhal fail to explicitly teach comprising for each transition device: an aligned copy of the coupling table and a network address for the respective transition device such that the address is associated with the copied table and wherein via the alignment protocol a content of the coupling table is transmitted to the server to dynamically update the allocation table thereby aligning the copy of the coupling table in the allocation table.

However, McKeeth discloses comprising for each transition device: an aligned copy of the coupling table and a network address for the respective transition device such that the address is associated with the copied table and wherein via the alignment protocol a content of the coupling table is transmitted to the server to dynamically update the allocation table thereby aligning the copy of the coupling table in the allocation table (column 5 lines 39-50, read as to maintain a current list of IP addresses, the server 230 periodically establishes a link with one or more other DNS servers to acquire a copy of an up-to-date list of IP addresses or to check that an existing list has not changed).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of McKeeth into the invention of

Lindgren and Singhal in order to ensure that the server has an up-to-date list of IP addresses as topology of the Internet changes (column 5 lines 39-50).

Consider **claim 2 and as applied to claim 1**. Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth disclose wherein the data packet network is realized by a network based on an Internet protocol (Lindgren; column 2 lines 15-19).

Consider **claim 3 and as applied to claim 1**. Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth disclose wherein the transition device further comprises a translator for translation between a network protocol used in the data packet network and a protocol specific to the short-range radio module (Lindgren; column 5 lines 45-51, Singhal; paragraph 28).

Consider **claim 4 and as applied to claim 3**. Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth disclose wherein the translator further comprises a detection unit for detecting, by means of the network protocol used, which terminal device-specific application a connection to a terminal device is allocated to, in order to be able to perform an application-specific protocol conversion accordingly (Lindgren; column 4 lines 42-56).

Consider **claim 5 and as applied to claim 3**. Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth disclose wherein the protocol specific to a radio module having a specific voice interface and a specific data interface (Lindgren; column 3 lines 22-34).

Consider **claim 6 and as applied to claim 1**. Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth disclose wherein the a short-range radio module is based on an 802.15.1 standard (Singhal; paragraph 45, claim 5).

Consider **claim 7 and as applied to claim 1**. Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth disclose wherein the allocation table is for determining a momentary location of a particular terminal (Lindgren; column 4 lines 42-56).

Consider **claim 8 and as applied to claim 1**. Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth disclose wherein a gateway device is coupled to the data packet network for coupling the data packet to a forwarding communication network (Lindgren; column 2 lines 20-30).

Consider **claim 12 and as applied to claim 2**. Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth disclose the transition device comprises a translator for translation between a network protocol used in the data packet network and a protocol specific to a radio module (Lindgren; column 4 lines 42-56).

Consider **claim 13 and as applied to claim 4**. Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth disclose wherein the protocol specific to a radio module having a specific voice interface and a specific data interface (Lindgren; column 3 lines 22-34).

Consider **claim 18 and as applied to claim 4**. Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth disclose wherein the address of the detected terminal is a telephone number (Lindgren; column 4 lines 34-38, 45-47).

Consider **claim 20 and as applied to claim 19**. Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth disclose wherein the address of the detected terminal is a telephone number (Lindgren; column 4 lines 34-38, 45-47).

Consider **claim 21 and as applied to claim 19**. Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth disclose wherein the address of the detected terminal is an e-mail address (McKeeth; column 4 lines 21-37).

Consider **claim 22 and as applied to claim 19**. Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth disclose wherein the address of the detected terminal is an universal resource locator (McKeeth; column 4 lines 21-37).

Consider **claim 23 and as applied to claim 19**. Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth disclose wherein the address of the detected terminal is an Internet Protocol address (Lindgren; column 4 lines 34-38, 45-47).

Consider **claim 24 and as applied to claim 19**. Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth disclose wherein the address of the gateway is an Internet Protocol address (Lindgren; column 4 lines 34-38, 45-47).

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lindgren et al. (US Patent 6,411,632 B2)** in view of **Singhal et al. (US PG PUB 2003/0041175 A2, hereinafter Singhal)** in view of **McKeeth (US Patent 7,188,175 B1)** and further in view of **Rautiola et al. (US Patent 6,853,851 B1, hereinafter Rautiola)**.

Consider **claim 9 and as applied to claim 1**. Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth disclose the claimed invention but fail to disclose a headset as a terminal device for voice connection.

However, Rautiola discloses a headset as a terminal device for voice connection (column 12 line 61 – column 13 line 13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of Rautiola into the invention of Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth in order to allow a user to use a lightweight terminal (column 3 lines 51-59).

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lindgren et al. (US Patent 6,411,632 B2)** in view of **Singhal et al. (US PGPUB 2003/0041175 A2, hereinafter Singhal)** in view of **McKeeth (US Patent 7,188,175 B1)** and further in view of **Bishop et al. (US Patent 6,850,512 B1, hereinafter Bishop)**.

Consider **claim 10 and as applied to claim 1**. Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth disclose the claimed invention but fail to disclose a PDA (Personal Digital Assistant) as a terminal device for data connections.

However, Bishop discloses a PDA (Personal Digital Assistant) as a terminal device for data connections (column 4 lines 10-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of Bishop into the invention of Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth in order to give the user the flexibility of a portable or laptop computer (column 4 lines 10-26).

Consider **claim 11 and as applied to claim 1**. Lindgren, Singhal, and McKeeth disclose the claimed invention but fail to disclose a PDA (Personal Digital Assistant) as a terminal device for entering destination addresses for outgoing connections and for initiating those connections.

However, Bishop discloses a PDA (Personal Digital Assistant) as a terminal device for entering destination addresses for outgoing connections and for initiating those connections (column 4 lines 10-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of Bishop into the invention of Lindgren,

Singhal, and McKeeth in order to be able to convert to a format suitable for transmission so that information can be transmitted (column 4 lines 10-26)

Conclusion

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher M. Brandt whose telephone number is (571) 270-1098.

The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30a.m. to 5p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on (571) 272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Christopher M. Brandt

C.M.B./cmb

August 3, 2008

/George Eng/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617